

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 12, 15, 22, and 23 have been amended and new claims 32-35 have been added to recite additional features of the embodiments disclosed in the specification. In addition, the title was replaced with one more descriptive of the invention as claimed.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 3, 11, 12, and 22 for containing typographical errors or unspelled acronyms, or for failing to include the word “entity” after RLC. The claims have been made to overcome the grounds of objection.

Claims 11-31 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the phrase “based on a processing speed of a receiving buffer” is inaccurate. Claim 11 has been amended to recite “based on a processing speed of data stored in a receiving buffer.” Also, in claim 22, the word “stored” has been deleted before “receiving buffer.” Applicants submit that these amendments are sufficient to overcome the § 112, second paragraph, rejection.

Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of an ETSI-Le combination. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites that “acknowledgment information is transmitted simultaneously with the window size control information, the acknowledgment information controlling transmission of additional data from the transmitter to the receiver based on the varied transmitting window size.” These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

The ETSI publication discloses transmitting a status PDU from a receiver to a transmitter. The status PDU may include a super-field which adjusts the window size of the transmitter or which includes an acknowledgment signal. However, the ETSI publication does not teach or suggest transmitting the acknowledgment signal and window size control information simultaneously in a fro the transmitter to the receiver. Moreover, ETSI does not teach or suggest that this simultaneously transmitted acknowledgment information controls transmission of additional data based on the varied transmitting window size.

The Le patent also fails to teach or suggest these features. Le discloses adjusting a transmitter window size when a receiving host buffer becomes too full. But, Le does not teach or suggest the features added by amendment to claim 1. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over an ETSI-Le combination.

Claim 11 recites that the “acknowledgment information is transmitted simultaneously with the window size update information, the acknowledgment information controlling transmission of additional data from the transmitting entity to the receiving entity based on the window size update information.” These features are not taught or suggested by the ETSI and Le references, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 11 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 22 recites that “acknowledgment information is transmitted simultaneously with the window size control information, the acknowledgment information controlling transmission of said additional PDUs based on the varied transmitting window size.” These features are not taught or suggested by the ETSI and Le references, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 22 and its dependent claims are allowable.

New claims 32-35 have been added to the application.

Claim 32 recites that the acknowledgement information is included in a first super-field and the window size control information is included in a second super-field, the first and second super-fields transmitted simultaneously within a status protocol data unit (PDU) from the receiver to the transmitter. ETSI and Le do not teach or suggest these features.

Claim 33 recites that the transmitting window is varied to a size which allows previously received data stored in the receiving buffer to be arranged in sequence without said additional data from the transmitted being lost in the receiving buffer. These features are not taught or suggested by the ETSI and Le references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 34 recites “adjusting a window size of the receiving buffer based on the window size control information.” ETSI and Le do not teach or suggest these features. In fact, ETSI expressly teaches away from these features when it discloses that that the reception window size is not changed. (See page 33, Section 9.2.2.11.3).

Serial No. 10/650,792
Amdt. Dated October 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action of May 11, 2007


Docket No. P-0577

Claim 35 recites that the varied window size of the receiving buffer is adjusted to be equal the transmitting window size varied based on the window size control information. ETSI and Le do not teach or suggest these features.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw
Date: October 11, 2007

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610